

## **SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS**

The Examiner has objected to the layout for the specification as submitted because the section headings do not appear in upper case without underlining or bold type and all section headings as proscribed by 37 C.F.R. §1.77(b) are not present. Further, where no text follows a section heading the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow. Applicant would like note that, with the current backlog of applications at the United States Patent and Trademark Office having an estimated time of initiation of prosecution being a minimum of two years, it seems unnecessarily burdensome not only for Applicants but also for the Office in requiring additional sections in a specification which do not apply. In compliance with the Examiners requests please amend the specification as follows:

Replace "Description" with "TITLE OF INVENTION";

Insert "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APLICATIONS, Not applicable" on page 1 line 7 before "Technical Field";

Insert "STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT, Not applicable" on page 1 after the section titled "CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APLICATIONS";

Insert "THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT, Not applicable" on page 1 after the section titled "STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT";

Insert "INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC, Not applicable" on page 1 after the section titled "THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT";

Replace "Technical Field" with "TECHNICAL FIELD" on page 1, line 6;

Replace "Background of the Invention" with "BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION" on page 1, line 11;

Replace "Summary of the Invention" with "BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION" on page 2, line 26;

Replace "Description of the Figures" with "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S)" on page 4, line 1;

Replace "Detailed Description" with "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION" on page 4, line 14;

Replace "Claims" with "CLAIMS" on page 20, line 1;

Replace "Abstract" with "ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE" on page 22, line 1; and

Insert "SEQUENCE LISTING, Not applicable" on new page 23.

The Examiner states that a listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. Applicant agrees. Applicant also recognizes a duty to disclose information material to the patentability of a claim known to each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of a patent application under 37 CFR §1.56(a). Applicant and agent are the only individuals associated with the filing and prosecution of this patent application and neither is aware of any information that they feel is material to the patentability of any claim in this application. If so, Applicant and Agent would have filed an proper information disclosure statement. No information disclosure was filed because Applicant and Agent did not, and do not presently, know of any information that they believe would be material to the patentability of any claim in the application. Consequently, Applicant requests that the Examiner remove this rejection.

The Examiner further objects to the drawings because he believes that the drawings do not teach every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More specifically, he states that "a loom having a pre-cut slit along its length" must be shown in the drawing or the feature cancelled from the claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The pre-slit loom is NOT a feature of the invention under 37 CFR §1.83. The invention is a device comprising a splitter means and a wire insertion means. This invention is designed to perform the function of inserting a wire or cable into a loom having a pre-cut slit along its length. Since the pre-cut loom is not a feature of the invention according to 37 CFR §1.83 no such inclusion in the drawings is required and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove this rejection.

The Examiner further states that corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR §1.121(d) are required in reply to this Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Applicant is concerned and offended by this statement. 37 CFR §1.111 requires that the reply to an Office action by Applicant must be in a writing, which distinctly and specifically points out the errors in the Examiner's action and must reply to each and every ground of objection and rejection in the Office action. Further the Applicant's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action. Statements such as that made by the Examiner do not assist the Office or the Applicant in advancing the application to final action. In fact, it terminates a non-final Office action by threatening the Applicant into submitting to the Examiner's wishes whether or not the Examiner is in error. Because of this, Applicant strongly requests that the Examiner remove this rejection.